arXiv:1702.07470v1 [cs.ET] 24 Feb 2017

Exact Synthesis of Reversible Logic Circuits using Model Checking

Rajarshi Ray *Arup Deka* *Kamalika Datta*

Department of Computer Science and Engineering
National Institute of Technology Meghalaya, Shillong 793003, India
Email: rajarshi.ray@nitm.ac.in, arupdekajec@gmail.com, kdatta@nitm.ac.in

Abstract. Synthesis of reversible logic circuits has gained great attention during the last decade. Various synthesis techniques have been proposed, some generate optimal solutions (in gate count) and are termed as *exact*, while others are scalable in the sense that they can handle larger functions but generate sub-optimal solutions. Although scalable synthesis is very much essential for circuit design, exact synthesis is also of great importance as it helps in building design library for the synthesis of larger functions. In this paper, we propose an exact synthesis technique for reversible circuits using model checking. We frame the synthesis problem as a model checking instance and propose an iterative bounded model checking calls for an optimal synthesis. Experiments on reversible logic benchmarks shows successful synthesis of optimal circuits. We also illustrate optimal synthesis of random functions with as many as 10 variables and up to 10 gates.

Keywords: Reversible circuits, exact synthesis, model checking, NuSMV Model Checker

1 Introduction

Moore's law [1] has been witnessed to hold over the past years due to the great advancements in semiconductor fabrication technology, but recently, it is believed to have slowed down. The heat dissipation of the increasing number of transistors in the limited sizes processors, has become a major hurdle in sustaining Moore's law. In 1961, Landauer [2] stated that with every bit of information that is lost during a computation, a minimum of $KT \log 2$ Joules of energy is dissipated in the form of heat. In 1973 Bennett [3] showed that if zero heat dissipation is required, the computation has to be information loss-less. Reversible computing have gained interest as an alternative to continue Moore's law. Also, since quantum operations are inherently reversible, it can play a vital role in future quantum computing.

A reversible logic circuit consists of a cascade of basic reversible gates, without any fan-out or feedback connections. Also, the number of inputs must be

equal to number of outputs, and the circuit must implement a bijective mapping between the inputs and the outputs. Some well-known reversible gates are NOT, CNOT and Toffoli, which constitute the so-called NCT gate library. A reversible gate can be further decomposed into elementary gates known as quantum gates. The metrics that are generally used to evaluate the quality of a reversible circuit are: (a) The number of gates often called the *Gate Count* (GC), and (b) total number of elementary gates, called the *Quantum Cost* (QC). Given a boolean function to realize, various reversible circuit synthesis methods exist in the literature. These methods can be very broadly classified as either optimal/exact methods [4,5,6,7], or sub-optimal methods [8,9,10,11,12,13]. Exact synthesis methods are those which generate optimal solutions considering gate count as the metric. In order to guarantee optimality, these methods are generally in-efficient due to the large design space it has to explore, and therefore, can be used for very small functions with very few input lines. Sub-optimal methods on the other hand, are efficient but can provide far from optimal synthesis. For exact synthesis, there are methods that formulate the synthesis problem as a search problem and generates optimal gate netlists [5] [14] [7]. In [7], a solution based on reachability analysis has been proposed. In [5], the synthesis problem has been formulated as a SAT instance and a SAT solver is used to generate an optimum solution. All these methods are expensive, and provide solutions for small functions. The importance of these methods lie in the fact that they can be used to build libraries of small functions which can be used to construct larger functions.

In this paper, we propose an exact synthesis method based on a model checking approach [15]. Model checking is an algorithmic technique to verify whether certain properties hold on a system. The system to be verified is modeled mathematically and the property is specified using a specification logic. The contribution in our work is a proposal to model the computations involved in reversible logic synthesis as a Kripke structure [15] and defining LTL/CTL properties such that a falsification of the property on the model provides us with a synthesis, i.e., a sequence of Toffoli gates/permutations. We guarantee an optimal synthesis by searching for falsifying behavior (sequence of gates) within a fixed length by bounded model checking [16], and iteratively increasing the bound till we find a falsification for the first time. Apart from being a novel synthesis technique, the advantage of our method is - the limits of functions that can be synthesized exactly can be extended by riding on the advances in model checking techniques. Synthesis of up to 10 input random circuits can be achieved and results on benchmark circuits are also obtained and compared with other existing optimal methods.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. Section 2 provides a brief background on reversible logic synthesis and model checking. Section 3 discuss our proposed synthesis method in detail. In Section 4, we discuss the implementation of our proposed method in the NuSMV model checker and the experimental results. We conclude in Section 5.

2 Background

2.1 Reversible Logic Circuit

A n-input, n-output boolean function is called reversible if it implements a bijective mapping between the inputs and the outputs. In other words, every input combination maps into a unique output combination, and vice versa. A non-reversible function can be made reversible through a process called *reversible embedding*, by adding extra input lines (called *ancilla inputs*) and extra output lines (called *garbage outputs*) as required. more extra output line known as garbage outputs. In addition to gate cost and quantum cost, reduction in the number of ancilla and garbage lines is also often a design objective.

The bijective mapping implemented by a reversible circuit can also be represented as a permutation. For example, the reversible circuit CNOT shown in Figure 1 implements the input to output mapping as ($00 \rightarrow 00$, $01 \rightarrow 01$, $10 \rightarrow 11$, $11 \rightarrow 10$). This mapping can be represented by the permutation P = {0 1 3 2}. In a reversible circuit, the gates are represented by specific symbols, where $\oplus$ represents the target connection and a $\bullet$ represents a control connection. The controls are connected to the target by a vertical line. The logic value on the target line gets inverted if and only if the logic values on all the control lines are 1. There are many basic types of reversible gates reported in the literature. The gates NOT, CNOT, and Toffoli, as explained below, is a universal set of gates and constitute the so-called NCT gate library (see Figure 1).

- A NOT gate just inverts the particular input and produces the output ($x_1 \rightarrow x_1'$).
- CNOT or controlled-NOT gate is a 2-input gate, with control connection on line x_1 and target line on another line x_2. If x_1 is 1, the logic value on line x_2 gets inverted; that is, the gate implements the mapping $(x_1, x_2) \rightarrow (x_1, x_1 \oplus x_2)$.
- Toffoli gate is a 3-input gate with two control lines x_1, x_2 and one target line x_3, where the target line is inverted when both the control lines are at 1. The gate implements the mapping $(x_1, x_2, x_3) \oplus (x_1, x_2, x_1x_2 \oplus x_3)$.



Fig. 1. Gates of the NCT library

A *Multiple-Control Toffoli* (MCT) gate is a generalization of the Toffoli gate with arbitrary number of control lines and one target line, as shown in Figure 2. The target line gets inverted when all the control lines are at 1. In the proposed

work, given a reversible function to be synthesized, we first model the problem formally and then feed the same to a model checking tool. The tool provides an optimal set of MCT gates to realize the given function as output.



Fig. 2. A MCT gate

An example reversible circuit is shown in Figure 3, which consists of one Toffoli gate and four CNOT gates.



Fig. 3. An example reversible circuit

2.2 The Optimal Synthesis Problem

Suppose that we want to synthesize a 4-input reversible circuit that realizes the permutation $P = \{0, 1, 2, 11, 4, 5, 15, 6, 8, 13, 10, 14, 9, 12, 3, 7\}$. The permutation P can be expressed as the composition of four permutations, $P = P_1 \circ P_2 \circ P_3 \circ P_4$, where

$$P_1 = \{0, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 13, 12, 15, 14\}$$
$$P_2 = \{0, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 13, 10, 15, 12, 9, 14, 11\}$$
$$P_3 = \{0, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 6, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 15, 14\}$$
$$P_4 = \{0, 1, 2, 11, 4, 5, 6, 15, 8, 9, 10, 3, 12, 13, 14, 7\}$$

each of which can be realized by a Toffoli gate as shown in Figure 4. Given a final permutation P to be realized as a reversible logic circuit, the synthesis problem that we address is to search for a minimum length sequence of permutations, $P_1, P_2, \ldots, P_n$ such that $P = P_1 \circ P_2 \circ \ldots \circ P_n$. Such a sequence gives as a synthesis of the circuit as a cascade of Tofolli gates $TG_1 \rightarrow TG_2 \rightarrow \ldots TG_{n-1}$, where each gate TG_i transforms the function $P_1 \circ P_2 \ldots P_i$ to the new function given by $P_1 \circ P_2 \ldots P_{i+1}$. As we shall explain, it is possible to obtain the Toffoli gate sequence from the permutation sequence and vice-versa.



Fig. 4. Permutation decomposition and synthesis example

2.3 Model Checking

There are various mathematical formalisms to model a system such as Finite State Machines (FSMs), Kripke models [15], Binary Decision Diagrams (BDDs) [17] and Ordered Binary Decision Diagrams (OBDDs) [18] to name a few. The commonly used property specification logic used are Linear Time Temporal logic (LTL) [19] and Computational Tree Logic (CTL) [20].We now briefly describe Kripke models, LTL specification logic and the model checking algorithms for LTL.

A Kripke Model A Kripke model is a type of finite state machine represented by four tuples $\mathcal{M}(V, S, R, L)$ where V is a finite set of states, $S \subseteq V$ is the set of initial states, $R \subseteq S \times S$ is a transition relation, and L is a function which maps every state to a set of atomic proposition which are true in that state. A Kripke model of a simple telephone is shown in Figure 5 for illustration. The components of the model $\mathcal{M}(V, S, R, L)$ are as follows:

$$
\begin{aligned}
V &= \{S1, S2, S3\} \\
S &= \{S1\} \\
R &= \{\{S1, S2\}, \{S1, S3\}, \{S2, S1\}, \{S2, S3\}, \\
&\quad \{S3, S1\}, \{S3, S3\}\} \\
L(S1) &= \{Ready, \neg Dialing, \neg Busy\} \\
L(S2) &= \{\neg Ready, Dialing, \neg Busy\} \\
L(S3) &= \{\neg Ready, \neg Dialing, Busy\}
\end{aligned}
$$

The telephone has three states $S1$, $S2$, $S3$ and three atomic propositions *Ready*, *Dialing* and *Busy*. Initially, the telephone is in the state $S1$ having only the proposition *Ready* as *true*. From $S1$, it can either take a transition to $S2$ having *Dialing* as true or it can take a transition to $S3$ having *busy* as true by receiving an incoming call. From the state $S2$, the telephone may either take a transition to state $S3$ when there is a connection or it may take a transition to $S1$ in case connection cannot be established. From $S3$, there can be either a transition to itself or a transition to $S1$ when the call ends.



Fig. 5. Kripke model of a Telephone

A property to be verified on the model of a telephone is that it should not be in any state where both *Dialing* and *Busy* are true.

Linear Time Temporal Logic Temporal logic provides a specification of the ordering of different events in the system without explicitly specifying the time [19]. LTL properties are evaluated over computation paths which are infinite sequence of states of the model. An example of a path starting from state S_1 in the model of Figure 5 is $\pi = S_1 \rightarrow S_2 \rightarrow S_3 \rightarrow S_3 \rightarrow \ldots$. An LTL formula has the following syntax [21]:

$$\phi := \top \mid \bot \mid \psi \mid (X\phi) \mid (F\phi) \mid (G\phi) \mid (\phi_1 U \phi_2) \tag{1}$$

where ψ is any propositional formula and X, F, G and U are the basic temporal connectors. For a path $\pi = s_1 \rightarrow s_2 \rightarrow s_3 \rightarrow \ldots$, π^i shall represent the suffix of the path starting from the state s_i in π. The satisfaction relation $\models$ between π and an LTL formula ϕ is defined below [21]:

- $\pi \models \mathbf{X}\phi$ *iff* $\pi^2 \models \phi$.
- $\pi \models \mathbf{G}\phi$ *iff* $\forall i \geq 1$, $\pi^i \models \phi$.
- $\pi \models \mathbf{F}\phi$ *iff* $\exists i \geq 1$ *such that* $\pi^i \models \phi$.
- $\pi \models \phi_1 \mathbf{U} \phi_2$ *iff* $\exists i \geq 1$ *such that* $\pi^i \models \phi$ *and* $\forall j = 1, \ldots, i-1$, $\pi^j \models \phi_1$.

A model $\mathcal{M}$ satisfies ϕ *iff* all computation paths of $\mathcal{M}$ starting from an initial state satisfies ϕ. The LTL model checking algorithm consists of constructing a Kripke model $\mathcal{M}_{\neg\phi}$, ($\neg$ is the logical not operator), with Buchi accepting condition, i.e., a path in the model is accepting *iff* it has some final state repeating infinitely often. The construction of $\mathcal{M}_{\neg\phi}$ is such that it accepts precisely those paths which satisfies $\neg\phi$. This model is then combined with $\mathcal{M}$ resulting in a model whose paths are present both in $\mathcal{M}$ and $\mathcal{M}_{\neg\phi}$. If there is no such combined path, we deduce that $\mathcal{M}$ satisfies ϕ. The presence of a combined path implies a computation path in $\mathcal{M}$ that does not satisfy ϕ and is thus a counter-example to the specification.

State Space Explosion The construction of the Kripke model $\mathcal{M}_\phi$ for an LTL formula ϕ is $O(|\phi| \cdot 2^{|\phi|})$. Computing the product of $\mathcal{M}_\phi$ and $\mathcal{M}$ and then checking for a path in the product results in the complexity of $O(|V + E| \cdot 2^{\phi})$. Therefore, LTL model checking algorithm is exponential in the size of the formula and linear in the size of the model. The labeling algorithm for CTL model checking performs state labeling starting from the simplest sub-formulas iteratively. If there are k connectives in the formula, the model has to be labeled k times. The labeling of formula $AG\phi$ and $EG\phi$ are expensive as it requires performing a breadth first search for every vertex of the model. This gives the complexity of the algorithm as $O(k \cdot V \cdot (V + E))$, V and E being the number of vertices and edges in the model respectively. The complexity can be reduced to $O(k \cdot (V + E))$ by computing the strongly connected components followed by breadth first search for labeling the expensive connectors as mentioned earlier. Although CTL model checking is linear in both the size of the formula and the model, the size of the model itself grows exponentially with the number of variables of the system. This exponential growth of state-space is known as the state space explosion problem. Various methods have been proposed to overcome this problem and implemented in the model checkers [22,23].

We see that the size of our proposed model of reversible logic synthesis computationis exponential in the number of input variables of the function to be realized.

3 Proposed Synthesis Method

A reversible circuit with n inputs can be represented as a pair of input-output permutation of elements in the integer set $\{0, 1, \ldots, 2^n - 1\}$. The input permutation is usually fixed to $(0, 1, \ldots, 2^n - 1)$ showing the decimal representation of all possible inputs in an n input circuit. The output permutation is a permutation of the elements in the set $(0, 1, \ldots, 2^n - 1)$ showing the decimal representation of the output lines corresponding to the inputs. The optimal synthesis problem is to find a minimum sequence of MCT gates which realizes the output permutation from the input permutation, if feasible. In this work, we attempt the synthesis problem by proposing a Kripke model such that a path in the model shows the evolution of permutations from the input permutation corresponding to the application of a sequence of MCT gates. The goal then is to find a computation path in the model from the initial state to a goal state corresponding to the desired output permutation. The existence of such a path is searched by a model checker when directed to do so with a LTL/CTL specification formula.

In our proposed model, there are two components which are composed synchronously. One of the components model the selection of a MCT gate out of all the possible gates in an n input logic. The other component models the transition from the current permutation to the next permutation when the selected gate in the other module is applied. The composition models the computation of permutations. We now present our proposed models for the mentioned two components.

3.1 Model of MCT Gate Selection

There are $n.2^{n-1}$ MCT gates possible with an n input logic. We use a boolean encoding to uniquely encode each of the MCT gates. Our encoding uses $\lceil \log_2 n \rceil$ bits to encode the position of the target line in the gate since it can be in any of the n lines. In the remaining $n-1$ lines, a control may or may not be present which is encoded with a bit per line. In total, we use $\lceil \log_2 n \rceil + n - 1$ bits to encode a MCT gate. The $\lceil \log_2 n \rceil$ most significant bits (msb) are used to encode the target line number and the remaining bits encode the control lines of the MCT gate. Figure 6 shows an example of a 4 input MCT gate. Encoding of the target line position needs $\lceil \log_2 4 \rceil = 2$ bits. Our encoding counts the first input line of the MCT from above as line number 0 and encodes the target line there by 00 in the two msb bits. For representing the controls, the encoding use the remaining 3 bits. The absence of control in line 1 and the presence of control in line 2, line 3 is encoded by 011.

Using the above encoding, a MCT gate selection can be modeled by selecting bit entries of $b_0, b_1, \ldots, b_{\lceil \log_2 n \rceil + n - 2}$ at random. We model this by having a Kripke model per bit b_i as shown in Figure 7. The model chooses to either flip or retain b_i non-deterministically. The model of the gate selection is then obtained by composing the models for b_0 to $b_{\lceil \log_2 n \rceil + n - 2}$. Note that the size of the composed model is $O(2^n)$ where n is the number of bits in the MCT Gate encoding.



Fig. 6. Encoding of a 4-input MCT gate



Fig. 7. Kripe Model of a bit value selection

3.2 Model of Permutation Transition

Given a valuation of the n input lines and an encoding of a selected MCT gate to be applied to the input lines, the transition of the input to the next valuation is computed using a Kripke model. Every input to output transition (2^n) is computed individually by independent transition models. All the models are composed as depicted in Figure 8 to compute the transition of the input permutation.



Fig. 8. Transition using Kripke models

The atomic propositions of the transition Kripke model are the inputs $i_0, \ldots, i_{n-1}$, and the encoding of the selected MCT gate given by $t_1, \ldots, t_k, c_0, \ldots, c_{n-2}$. In total, there are $\lceil \log_2 n \rceil + 2n - 1$ propositions in the model. The initial state of the transition model has the initial values of the input lines as $i_0, \ldots, i_{n-1}$. Observe that the application of any possible MCT gate may flip the values of only the input proposition i_{tg} where tg is the target line of the gate keeping the remaining propositions fixed. The transitions of the model is given by the *next* relation shown in Eqn. (2) assuming that $tg \in \{0, \ldots, n-1\}$ is the target line specified by variables $t_1, \ldots, t_k$ of the gate encoding.

$$next(i_k) = \begin{cases} i_k & tg \neq k \\ i_k \oplus \bigwedge_{j=0}^{n-2} (\neg c_j + i_\ell) & otherwise. \end{cases} \tag{2}$$

where $\ell = j$ for $0 \leq j < tg$ and $\ell = j+1$ otherwise. $+$ and $\bigwedge$ denote boolean OR and AND operation respectively. It can be easily verified that the *next* transition relation models the application of the selected MCT gate on the input. In this way, the above model in composition with the gate selection model emulates the computation of states beginning with the state with the initial permutation to the next possible permutations.

3.3 Specification in LTL and CTL

In order to carry out logic synthesis using the model checker, we feed it with the model of the computation along with a specification in LTL or CTL formula. The property we specify is *there does not exist any computation path from the given initial permutation to the goal permutation state*. If the model checker finds the specification to be false, then it produces a counter-example which is precisely the sequence of MCT gate-ids to be applied to the input permutation in order to obtain the required output permutation. On the other hand, if the model checker finds the specification true then it implies that no synthesis is possible for the given input-output permutation pair. Let ϕ be the propositional formula which is true only in the state where the output permutation is true (the values of $i_0, \ldots, i_{n-1}$ in the output permutation), then we use the future operation in LTL and specify $\neg F(\phi)$ to specify that a path does not have any future state where the goal permutation is true. When this LTL formula is given to a model checker, it checks the property for all the computation paths beginning from the initial state of the model. Similarly, we specify the CTL formula $\neg EF(\phi)$ to specify the negation of there exist a computation path from the initial permutation state which has a future state with the goal permutation as true.

3.4 Optimal Synthesis

It may be noted that the reversible logic synthesis method using above mentioned LTL/CTL specification gives a solution which may not be optimal. For optimal synthesis, we use bounded model checking, whereby we verify the specification on paths of bounded length. We increment the bound iteratively, and look for counter-example from the model checker at every step. The smallest bound for which the model checker finds a counter-example is guaranteed to produce a logic synthesis solution using minimum number of gates. The procedure is outlined in Algorithm 1. The function *MC.get()* in line 8 is used to retrieve a counter-example from the model checker.

Algorithm 1 Optimal Logic Synthesis with Bounded Model Checking

```
1: procedure OPTIMAL SYNTHESIS(MC, M, φ)  ▷ φ is the LTL/CTL spec, MC is a Model Checker
2:     bound ← 0
3:     for bound ≤ MAXBOUND do
4:         c ←MC(M,φ)
5:         if c is true then
6:             bound++
7:         else
8:             Counterexample ← MC.get(M, φ)
9:         end if
10:    end for
11: end procedure
```

4 Experimental Results

We implement our model as described in the previous section, in the input language of the NuSMV model checker [24]. NuSMV is an open source model checker with a large user community. The input language allows modular implementation to ease modeling of complex systems. Every NuSMV file must have a *main* module. Different components of the system can be implemented as separate *modules*, similar to functions in C language. We implement the gate selection and the transition component as separate modules described in the earlier section. An LTL formula in NuSMV is specified using the *LTLSPEC* keyword.

The implementation takes the number of variables and the desired goal permutation as the inputs, and generates the optimal gate sequence as output. In the implementation, we have considered $(0, 1, 2, 3, \ldots, 2^n - 1)$ as the initial permutation, where n denotes the number of inputs. Given the goal permutation, we generate the LTL specification that there exist no sequence of MCT gates that can realize the goal permutation. The model checker NuSMV then checks for the correctness of the claim and returns a sequence of MCT gates, if the assumed claim is found to be false. If the assumed claim is true, we know that the synthesis is not possible.

Since our proposed method is an exact synthesis method, we have compared the synthesis results with other reported exact synthesis methods [5,9,25] only. The results are summarized in Tables 1 for input size of 3, and Table 2 for input sizes of 4, 5 and 6. The experiments are performed on an Intel core-i3 desktop with 2.40 GHz and 4GB main memory, running Ubuntu v14.04. The tables only show the benchmarks reported in the previously published papers are shown. In the tables, the first column shows the name of the benchmark where known, while the second column shows the number of inputs n. The next three columns show the gate count as reported in [9], [5] and [25] respectively, where the entries marked as '$-$' indicate that values have not been reported. The last three columns of the tables show the gate count (GC), quantum cost (QC), and run time using the proposed algorithm. We observe that the minimum gate count synthesis obtained with our proposed solution matches with the previously reported methods. This establishes the correctness of our method. As evident from the results, we could also synthesize a number of benchmarks optimally, for which previous works did not report any solution. It is not known whether they were not reported because the earlier methods could not obtain solution on these benchmarks or these were skipped in their evaluation.

Table 3 shows synthesis results for many randomly generated 6, 7, 8, 9 and 10 size input permutations. Note that the permutations are chosen such that the optimal gate count to synthesize these is bounded by 10. The experiments illustrate that our method could generate minimum gate solutions for input size of 10 variables, when the optimal solution is bounded by 10 gates, within reasonable memory and time constraint.

Table 1. Result of the experiments input size = 3

Name	Given permutation	Gate Count (GC)			Proposed Algorithm		
		[9]	[5]	[25]	GC	QC	Time (sec)
Peres	0,3,2,5,4,7,6,1	–	2	–	2	6	0.04
Fredkin	0,1,2,5,4,3,6,7	–	3	–	3	7	0.06
Ham3	0,7,4,3,2,5,1,6	5	5	–	5	9	0.09
N^{th}prime	0,2,3,5,7,1,4,6	–	–	–	4	8	0.07
Ex1	4,5,6,1,0,7,2,3	–	4	–	4	16	0.06
	1,0,3,2,5,7,4 6	4	–	–	4	8	0.07
	7,0,1,2,3,4,5,6	3	–	–	3	7	0.05
Miller	0,1,2,4,3,5,6,7	5	5	–	5	9	0.08
	1,2,3,4,5,6,7,0	3	–	–	3	7	0.05
	3,6,2,5,7,1,0,4	7	–	–	7	19	0.18
	1,2,7,5,6,3,0,4	6	–	–	6	14	0.12
	7,5,2,4,6,1,0,3	7	–	–	7	19	0.17
	7,6,5,4,3,2,1,0	–	–	–	3	3	0.05
	4,3,0,2,7,5,6,1	6	–	–	6	10	0.12
3-17	7,1,4,3,0,2,6,5	6	6	–	6	14	0.09

Table 2. Synthesis results for n = 4, 5 and 6

Name	n	GC using			Proposed approach		
		[9]	[5]	[25]	GC	QC	Time (sec)
1-bit-adder	4	5	–	–	4	12	0.11
2-to-4-decoder	4	–	6	–	6	18	0.30
decode-42	4	–	–	10	10	30	45.83
Mperk	4	–	–	9	9	17	2.04
Imark	4	–	–	7	7	19	0.49
4_49	4	–	–	12	12	72	12659.30
hwb4	4	–	–	11	11	23	232.88
Oc5	4	–	–	11	11	39	704.10
Oc6	4	–	–	12	12	44	14408.50
4gt5	5	–	4	–	3	19	0.33
mod5_mills	5	–	5	–	5	13	0.70
mod5d_1	5	–	7	–	7	15	6.84
mod5d_2	5	–	8	–	8	16	5.77
mod5	5	–	–	–	7	15	6.23
4mod5_younus	5	–	–	–	5	9	0.71
4mod5_miller	5	5	–	–	5	13	0.78
graycode	6	–	5	–	5	5	2.22
permanent2x2	6	–	–	–	3	23	1.24

5 Conclusion

In this paper, an exact synthesis method has been proposed for reversible logic circuits. The synthesis problem has been framed as an instance of model checking and the NuSMV model checker is used to generate the solutions. Experimental results on benchmarks verifies that the method indeed generates optimal circuits (a cascade of MCT Gates of minimum length). Many random functions having as many as 10 input 10 variables could be optimally generated, having up to 10 MCT gates. This shows that our method does scale to handle even large functions. Though, results to synthesize benchmarks of large size (8 or more input variables) remains to be verified.

Table 3. Synthesis results on random permutations with 6, 7, 8, 9 and 10 inputs

Name	Proposed approach		
	GC	QC	Time (sec)
*random*_1(n=6)	4	48	0.669
*random*_2(n=6)	5	25	0.877
*random*_3(n=6)	6	78	1.340
*random*_4(n=6)	8	84	9.253
*random*_5(n=6)	10	122	76.809
*random*_1(n=7)	4	52	2.440
*random*_2(n=7)	5	75	3.182
*random*_3(n=7)	6	63	4.635
*random*_4(n=7)	7	179	7.169
*random*_4(n=7)	8	192	11.224
*random*_4(n=7)	9	188	140.065
*random*_5(n=7)	10	174	279.483
*random*_1(n=8)	4	143	10.199
*random*_2(n=8)	5	184	12.791
*random*_3(n=8)	6	114	17.091
*random*_4(n=8)	8	160	47.674
*random*_5(n=8)	10	213	2333.793
*random*_1(n=9)	6	79	84.316
*random*_2(n=9)	8	110	174.604
*random*_3(n=9)	10	373	3679.524
*random*_1(n=10)	6	175	414.778
*random*_2(n=10)	8	215	1018.712
*random*_3(n=10)	10	501	6110.31

References

1. G. E. Moore. Cramming more components onto integrated circuits. *Journal of Electronics*, 38(8):183–191, 1965.
2. R. Landauer. Irreversibility and heat generation in computing process. *IBM Journal of Research and Development*, 5(3):183–191, July 1961.
3. C. H. Bennett. Logical reversibility of computation. *IBM Journal of Research and Development*, 17(6):525–532, November 1973.
4. R. Wille, D. Grosse, L. Teuber, G. W. Dueck, and R. Drechsler. Revlib: An online resource for reversible functions and reversible circuits. In *Intl Symp. on Multi-Valued Logic*, pages 220–225, May 2008.
5. D. Grosse, R. Wille, G. W. Dueck, and R. Drechsler. Exact multiple control Toffoli network synthesis with SAT techniques. *IEEE Trans. on CAD of Integrated Circuits and Systems*, 28(5):703–715, May 2009.
6. R. Wille, M. Soeken, N. Przigoda, and R. Drechsler. Exact synthesis of toffoli gate circuits with negative control lines. In *Intl. Symp. on Multi-Valued Logic*, pages 69–74, 2012.
7. W. N. N. Hung, X. Song, G. Yang, J. Yang, and M. Perkowski. Optimal synthesis of multiple output boolean functions using a set of quantum gates by symbolic reachability analysis. *IEEE Trans. on CAD of Integrated Circuits and Systems*, 25(9):1652–1663, September 2006.
8. P. Gupta, A. Agrawal, and N. K. Jha. An algorithm for synthesis of reversible logic circuits. *IEEE Trans. on CAD of Integrated Circuits and Systems*, 25(11):2317–2329, 2006.
9. K. Datta, G. Rathi, I. Sengupta, and H. Rahaman. Synthesis of reversible circuits using heuristic search method. In *Intl. Conference on VLSI Design*, pages 328–333, 2012.
10. K. Datta, I. Sengupta, and H. Rahaman. Reversible circuit synthesis using particle swarm optimization. In *International Symposium on Electronic Circuit Design*, December 2012.
11. R. Wille and R. Drechsler. BDD-based synthesis of reversible logic for large functions. In *Design Automation Conference*, pages 270–275, 2009.
12. K. Fazel, M. A. Thornton, and J.E. Rice. ESOP-based Toffoli gate cascade generation. In *Pacific Rim Conference on Communications, Computers and Signal Processing*, pages 206–209, 2007.
13. R. Drechsler, A. Finder, and R. Wille. Improving ESOP-based synthesis of reversible logic using evolutionary algorithms. In *Intl. Conference on Applications of Evolutionary Computation*, pages 151–161, April 2011.
14. G. Yang, X. Song, W. N. N. Hung, and M. A. Perkowski. Fast synthesis of exact minimal reversible circuits using group theory. In *ASP Design Automation Conference*, pages 1002–1005, 2005.
15. Edmund M. Clarke, Jr., Orna Grumberg, and Doron A. Peled. *Model Checking*. MIT Press, Cambridge, MA, USA, 1999.
16. Armin Biere, Alessandro Cimatti, Edmund M Clarke, Ofer Strichman, and Yunshan Zhu. Bounded model checking. *Advances in computers*, 58:117–148, 2003.
17. C. Y. Lee. Representation of switching circuits by binary-decision programs. *Bell System Technical Journal*, 38(4):985–999, 1959.
18. Randal E. Bryant. Graph-based algorithms for boolean function manipulation. *IEEE Trans. Computers*, 35(8):677–691, 1986.

19. Amir Pnueli. The temporal logic of programs. In *Proceedings of the 18th Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science*, SFCS '77, pages 46–57, Washington, DC, USA, 1977. IEEE Computer Society.
20. E. Allen Emerson and Edmund M. Clarke. Using branching time temporal logic to synthesize synchronization skeletons. *Sci. Comput. Program.*, 2(3):241–266, 1982.
21. Michael Huth and Mark Ryan. *Logic in Computer Science: Modelling and Reasoning about Systems*. Cambridge University Press, 2004.
22. J. R. Burch, E. M. Clarke, K. L. McMillan, D. L. Dill, and L. J. Hwang. Symbolic model checking: 1020 states and beyond. *Inf. Comput.*, 98(2):142–170, June 1992.
23. EdmundM. Clarke, William Klieber, Milo Novek, and Paolo Zuliani. Model checking and the state explosion problem. In Bertrand Meyer and Martin Nordio, editors, *Tools for Practical Software Verification*, volume 7682 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 1–30. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2012.
24. Alessandro Cimatti, Edmund M. Clarke, Fausto Giunchiglia, and Marco Roveri. NUSMV: A new symbolic model checker. *STTT*, 2(4):410–425, 2000.
25. O. Golubitsky, S. M. Falconer, and D. Maslov. Synthesis of the optimal 4-bit reversible circuits. 12, 2010.